

OCT 13 2016

EPA-REGION 10

US Environmental Protection Agency
ATTN: Harbor Comments
805 SW Broadway, Suite 500
Portland, OR 97205

Because the EPA wants to dredge the Willamette in Portland, the cost is going to be high. The estimate of just under \$1 billion isn't likely to hold, and it is taxpayers who will incur these costs and all increases. It's unfair to put taxpayers in this position when it's possible to utilize other methods that would cost far less and impede the river in a much less invasive manner. The restrictions in this case are much more stringent and costly than they have been in other areas with similar circumstances. The monetary cost being passed on to the state and to the city of Portland is unfair. The local citizens deserve more of an input when it comes to developing a plan to address the problem with the river. After all, if it's going to be paid for locally through tax increases, then the locals should be able to make objections to it.

Though this plan has been in development since procuring contamination data in 2004, the extended process has resulted in a plan that no longer addresses the problem properly. Current data suggests that the contamination levels in the Willamette have been reduced by a minimum of forty percent, yet the EPA is ignoring this significant change. Obviously working from data that is more than a decade old can be a problem in any field. In this case working from old data allows for a very costly solution to be proposed for a problem that doesn't even exist in the same manner as it once did. The information should definitely be updated before we approve any plan that is attempting to reduce contamination levels in the river. I think utilizing a less aggressive approach that allows the river to continue to do what it does naturally, and then coming in with more aggressive methods only after that levels off or in areas that are troublesome is a better way to approach the issue.

If taxes went up as a result of the EPA's plan, I wouldn't have any choice but to pay them. However, this plan could also increase my utility bills, which I also oppose. Neither increase is a viable option. These increases do not have to be implemented based on the decrease of contamination levels reflected in current data. Let's rework this plan in a way that recognizes the most recent data and puts the economics of the city and its residents at the forefront of concern.

Sincerely

(b) (6)

(b) (6)

Portland, OR 97232